# Numerical Synthesis of Pontryagin Optimal Control Minimizers Using Sampling-Based Methods

Runxin He Humberto Gonzalez

arXiv:1703.10751v1 [math.OC] 31 Mar 2017

***Abstract*— Optimal control remains as one of the most versatile frameworks in systems theory, enabling applications ranging from classical robust control to real-time safe operation of fleets of vehicles. While some optimal control problems can be efficiently solved using algebraic or convex methods, most general forms of optimal control must be solved using memory-expensive numerical methods.**

**In this paper we present a theoretical formulation and a corresponding numerical algorithm that can find Pontryagin-optimal inputs for general dynamical systems by using a direct method. Pontryagin-optimal inputs, those satisfying the Minimum Principle, can be found for many classes of problems using indirect methods. But convergent numerical methods to solve indirect problems are hard to find and often converge slowly. On the other hand, convergent direct optimal control methods are fast and founded on solid theory, but their limit points are usually Banach-optimal inputs, which are a weaker form of optimality condition.**

**Our result, founded on the theory of relaxed inputs as defined by J. Warga, establishes an equivalence between Pontryagin-optimal inputs and optimal relaxed inputs. Then, we formulate a sampling-based numerical method to approximate the Pontryagin-optimal relaxed inputs using an iterative method. Finally, using a provably-convergent numerical method, we synthesize approximations of the Pontryagin-optimal inputs from the sampled relaxed inputs.**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Optimal control is a theoretical and practical framework that has been widely used to analyze the behavior of controlled dynamical systems [1], [2], and to synthesize actuation actions for dynamical systems in the face of safety, robustness, or uncertainty considerations [3], [4]. While some optimal control problems can be solved using purely analytical or algebraic tools [5], modern computers and dynamical systems embedded in changing environments have led to a surge in numerical methods for optimal control [6]. Numerical methods for optimal control are typically divided into indirect methods, where the optimal solution is found as the solution of a set of equations typically derived from necessary optimality conditions, and direct methods, where the solution is found by iteratively minimizing the cost function at hand.

In this paper we present a theoretical formulation and a corresponding numerical algorithm, capable of finding optimal control inputs that satisfy the Pontryagin Minimum Principle by using a direct method. Our result is founded on the theory of relaxed control, as defined by J. Warga [7], [8], which we use to derive a convergent sampling-based numerical method. Once a relaxed control has been numerically computed, we use a projection operation originally devised for switched dynamical systems by Vasudevan et al. [9], [10], originally inspired by the theoretical work of Berkovitz [11] and Bengea et al. [12], to synthesize arbitrarily accurate approximations of the trajectories generated by the relaxed inputs.

It is worth noting that while most numerical optimal control methods are provably convergent, they do not necessarily converge to input signals satisfying the Minimum Principle. Indeed, as shown by Polak [13, Sec. 4.2.6] and Schwartz [14], direct numerical methods that rely on explicit time discretization schemes converge to inputs satisfying necessary optimality conditions based on directional derivatives, which are strictly weaker than those resulting from the Minimum Principle. On the other hand, direct methods that converge to inputs satisfying the Minimum Principle can be developed, but often result in impractical implementations that require solving sequences of nonlinear programming problems [15].

It is possible to develop indirect methods that converge to inputs satisfying the Minimum Principle which lead to multiple-point boundary-value problems [6]. For example, a common indirect method is the shooting method [16], [17], which only converges for suitably chosen initial guesses [18].

Our result bridges a significant gap between the formulation of conceptual algorithms, which have excellent theoretical properties but fail to provide practical implementations, and implementable algorithms, which converge to input signals that do not necessarily satisfy the Minimum Principle. Moreover, our method achieves its goals in a numerically efficient and scalable way, which is suitable for applications where accuracy can be traded for computational speed.

Our paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces our notation and the optimal control problem we aim to solve. A conceptual algorithm is presented in Section III, and Section IV describes an implementable sampling-based numerical algorithm. Finally, simulation results are shown in Section V.

## II. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

We begin by introducing notation and preliminary results necessary to formulate our theoretical and numerical results in Section II-A. Then, in Section II-B, we formulate the conceptual optimal control problem we will address throughout this paper.

The authors are with the Department of Electrical & Systems Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130. Email: {r.he,hgonzale}@wustl.edu.

### A. Preliminaries

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \geq 1$, we denote the standard finite-dimensional $p$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_p$, and the induced matrix $p$-norm by $\|\cdot\|_{i,p}$. We will denote by $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the set of Radon measures defined over the Borel sets of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, given a $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that a function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is $L^2_\mu$-integrable, denoted $f \in L^2_\mu(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$, if there exists $p \geq 1$ such that $\|f\|_\mu = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \|f(x)\|_p^2 \,\mathrm{d}\mu(x)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$. To simplify, we will denote by $L^2(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$ the space of Lebesgue square-integrable functions. Furthermore, we say that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a probability measure if $\mu(\mathbb{R}^m) = 1$. We denote the set of all probability measures by $\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^m)$. A stochastic process is a function $\mu\colon [0,T] \to \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and throughout the paper we will simply write $\mu_t$ instead of $\mu(t)$.

Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ be two Radon measures. Then the difference between $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$, say $\nu = \mu_1 - \mu_2$, is a signed measure, and we define $L^2_\nu(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n) = L^2_{\mu_1}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n) \cap L^2_{\mu_2}(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$. Given $f \in L^2_\nu(\mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^n)$, its integral with respect to $\nu$ is defined by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x) \,\mathrm{d}\nu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x) \,\mathrm{d}\mu_1(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x) \,\mathrm{d}\mu_2(x). \quad (1)$$

### B. Conceptual Optimal Control Problem

We are interested in solving a control-constrained optimal control problem, formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{x \in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n) \\ u \in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^m)}} \quad & \Psi\big(x(T)\big), \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & x(0) = \xi, \\ & \dot{x}(t) = f\big(t, x(t), u(t)\big), \\ & u(t) \in U, \ \text{for a.e. } t \in [0,T], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $U$ is a connected and compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and the functions $f$ and $\Psi$ are well-defined, each with an appropriate domain and range. We will say that $f$ is the vector field, and $\Psi$ the final cost, of the problem in equation (2). Note that the optimal control problem in equation (2) is quite general, since other standard formulations, such as those including running cost functions or minimum-time cost functions, can be easily converted to it (see Sec. 4.1.2 in [13] for a thorough exposition of this topic).

First we give the following assumption to guarantee the uniqueness of the trajectories, as well as the convergence of our numerical method, in this paper.

*Assumption 2.1:* The functions $f$ and $\Psi$ are Lipschitz continuously differentiable. That is, there exists $L > 0$ such that, for each $t_1, t_2 \in [0,T]$, $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $u_1, u_2 \in U$:

$$|\Psi(x_1) - \Psi(x_2)| \leq L \|x_1 - x_2\|_2, \quad (3)$$

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}(x_1) - \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}(x_2) \right\|_2 \leq L \|x_1 - x_2\|_2, \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(t_1, x_1, u_1) - f(t_2, x_2, u_2)\|_2 \leq \\ \leq L\big(|t_1 - t_2| + \|x_1 - x_2\|_2 + \|u_1 - u_2\|_2\big), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t_1, x_1, u_1) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(t_2, x_2, u_2) \right\|_{i,2} \leq \\ \leq L\big(|t_1 - t_2| + \|x_1 - x_2\|_2 + \|u_1 - u_2\|_2\big), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(t_1, x_1, u_1) - \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(t_2, x_2, u_2) \right\|_{i,2} \leq \\ \leq L\big(|t_1 - t_2| + \|x_1 - x_2\|_2 + \|u_1 - u_2\|_2\big). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Then we relax the problem in equation (2) using the concept of relaxed inputs, as defined by J. Warga [8], [7]. Consider the following relaxed optimal control problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{x \in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \mu\colon [0,T] \to \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^m)}} \quad & \Psi\big(x(T)\big), \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & x(0) = \xi, \\ & \dot{x}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\big(t, x(t), u\big) \,\mathrm{d}\mu_t(u), \\ & \operatorname{supp}(\mu_t) \subset U, \ \text{for a.e. } t \in [0,T], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\operatorname{supp}(\mu_t)$ is the support of $\mu_t$, i.e., the smallest set $S$ such that $\mu_t(S) = 1$. In other words, instead of optimizing over the space of $L^2$ functions, we optimize over the space of stochastic processes defined on $U$.

According to [7, Theorem II.6.5], if the vector field $f(t,x,u)$ satisfies assumption 2.1, the relaxed system in problem (8) always has a solution. Given a fixed initial condition $x(0) = \xi$, we will denote the unique trajectory resulting from the stochastic process $\mu$ by $x^{(\mu)}$. For simplicity, we will also denote the unique trajectory resulting from an input $u$ by $x^{(u)}$.

Note that the problem in equation (2) is a particular case of the problem in equation (8). Indeed, given an arbitrary input $\hat{u} \in L^2([0,T], \mathbb{R}^m)$, the stochastic process defined by $\mu_t(S) = 1$ whenever $\hat{u}(t) \in S$, and $\mu_t(S) = 0$ otherwise, produces exactly the same trajectory as $\hat{u}$. Colloquially this particular stochastic process is written using Dirac Delta functions, i.e., $\mathrm{d}\mu_t(u) = \mathbb{1}\big(u - \hat{u}(t)\big) \,\mathrm{d}u$. This case implies that the feasible set of the relaxed problem is strictly larger than that of the original problem, thus resulting in lower optimal values for the relaxed problem. Yet, perhaps surprisingly, this is not the case, since both problems, original and relaxed, result in the same optimal values. The equivalence between original and relaxed problems follows since every point in the feasible set of the relaxed problem can be arbitrarily approximated using points in the feasible set of the original problem.

*Theorem 2.2:* Let $f$ be a vector field satisfying assumption 2.1, and let $\mu\colon [0,T] \to \mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^m)$ be a stochastic process. Then, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a control signal $\tilde{u}(t)$ such that for each $t \in [0,T]$, $\left\|x^{(\mu)}(t) - x^{(\tilde{u})}(t)\right\|_2 < \varepsilon$.

We omit a detailed proof due to space limitations. Nonetheless, this theorem is an extension of the Chattering Lemma [11, Theorem 4.1], taking advantage of the fact that, for each time $t$, the relaxed trajectory defined in equation (8) can be arbitrarily approximated using a finite number of vectors in $U$.

## III. OPTIMALITY CONDITIONS FOR OPTIMAL CONTROL

As shown by Pontryagin et al. [19] in their Minimum Principle, it is possible to find a necessary condition for optimal points that cannot be formulated using directional derivatives. On the other hand, KKT [20] necessary conditions, widely used in finite dimensional optimization problem, can be fully described using directional derivatives. As we show below, necessary conditions for the problem in equation (2) based on directional derivatives are strictly weaker than those based on the Minimum Principle. On the other hand, necessary conditions based on directional derivatives and the Minimum Principle are completely equivalent for the problem in equation (8).

Polak et al. [13], [14] have shown that numerical methods for optimal control that rely on common explicit time discretization methods converge to optimal points satisfying directional derivative-based necessary conditions. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge there exists no general direct numerical method for optimal control that is provably convergent to optimal inputs satisfying Minimum Principle optimality conditions.

### A. Optimality Functions

*Definition 3.1 (Section 1.2 in [13]):* Consider an optimization problem with feasible set $\mathcal{X}$. We say that $\theta\colon \mathcal{X} \to (-\infty, 0]$ is an optimality function iff whenever $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is a minimizer, then $\theta(x) = 0$.

Optimality functions are useful in practice since $\theta(x) < 0$ implies $x$ is *not* a minimizer. Hence, they can be used as numerical tests to check whether a minimizer has been reached.

Now, consider the following optimality functions for the original problem (2) with input $u_0$ and trajectory $x^{(u_0)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_{o,l}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big) = \\
&= \min_{\substack{\delta x \in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n) \\ \delta u \in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^m)}} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}\big(x^{(u_0)}(T)\big)' \delta x(T) \\
&\qquad \text{subject to:} \quad \delta x(0) = 0, \\
&\qquad\qquad \delta \dot{x}(t) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\big(t, x^{(u_0)}(t), u_0(t)\big)\delta x(t) + \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad + \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}\big(t, x^{(u_0)}(t), u_0(t)\big)\delta u(t), \\
&\qquad\qquad u_0(t) + \delta u(t) \in U, \ \text{for a. e. } t \in [0,T],
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_{o,h}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big) = \\
&= \min_{u \in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^m)} \int_0^T p_0(t)'\Big(f\big(t, x^{(u_0)}(t), u(t)\big) + \\
&\qquad\qquad - f\big(t, x^{(u_0)}(t), u_0(t)\big)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}t, \\
&\qquad \text{subject to:} \quad u(t) \in U, \ \text{for a. e. } t \in [0,T],
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $p_0(t)$ is the costate of the problem in equation (2), defined by:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_0(T) &= \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}\big(x^{(u_0)}(T)\big), \\
\dot{p}_0(t) &= -\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\big(t, x^{(u_0)}(t), u_0(t)\big)'\, p_0(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

*Proposition 3.2:* The functions $\theta_{o,l}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big)$ and $\theta_{o,h}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big)$, defined in equations (9) and (10), are optimality functions of the problem (2).

We omit a detailed proof. $\theta_{o,l}$ is has been proved as an optimality function by Polak [13, Theorem 5.6.8 and 5.6.9]. For $\theta_{o,h}$, it can be proved by constructing a contradiction to Pontryagin's Minimum Principle.

*Proposition 3.3:* For the original problem (2) with input $u_0$ and trajectory $x^{(u_0)}$, if $\theta_{o,h}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big)$ in equation (10) equals zero, then $\theta_{o,l}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big)$ in equation (9) equals zero.

We omit a detailed proof, but the result follows since, given $\theta_{o,l}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big) = 0$, we show that $u_0$ satisfies the Pontryagin Minimum Principle. Then, using the result in [13, Theorem 5.6.8 and 5.6.9], $\theta_{o,l}\big(x^{(u_0)}, u_0\big) = 0$ as well.

Note that the other direction of proposition 3.3 is not true in general [13, Section 4.2.6]. Thus for the deterministic original problem (2), it is hard to connect the directional and Pontryagin optimality functions. However, for the corresponding relaxed problem (8), we are going to show the connection between its directional and Pontryagin optimality functions and derive a related descent direction.

First we define an optimality function for the relaxed problem in equation (8). Given control's stochastic process as $\mu_0$, and its trajectory $x^{(\mu_0)}$, at time $t$, the Hamiltonian to the optimal control problem (8) is:

$$\begin{aligned}
&H\big(t, x^{(\mu)}(t), \mu_t, p(t)\big) = \\
&\qquad = p(t)' \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\big(t, x^{(\mu)}(t), u\big)\,\mathrm{d}\mu_t(u),
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $p(t)$ is the corresponding adjoint variable to the problem (8), such that

$$\begin{aligned}
p(T) &= \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x}\big(x^{(\mu)}\big)(T), \\
\dot{p}(t) &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\big(t, x^{(\mu)}(t), u\big)'\,\mathrm{d}\mu_t(u)\, p(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Then, the optimality function is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big) = \\
&= \min_{\nu\colon [0,T]\to\mathcal{M}_p(\mathbb{R}^m)} \int_0^T H\big(t,x^{(\mu_0)}(t),\nu_t,p_0(t)\big)+ \\
&\qquad\qquad - H\big(t,x^{(\mu_0)}(t),\mu_{0,t},p_0(t)\big)\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&= \min_{\delta\mu\colon [0,T]\to\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)} \int_0^T p_0(t)' \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\big(t,x^{(\mu_0)}(t),u\big)\,\mathrm{d}\delta\mu_t(u)\mathrm{d}t, \\
&\quad \text{subject to:} \quad \operatorname{supp}(\delta\mu_t+\mu_{0,t})\subset U, \\
&\qquad\qquad \delta\mu_t+\mu_{0,t}\geq 0, \\
&\qquad\qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\mathrm{d}\delta\mu_t(u)=0 \text{ for a.e. } t\in[0,T].
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Note that in the definition above, $\delta\mu_t$ is a signed measure in $\mathbb{R}^m$.

*Proposition 3.4:* Let a stochastic process $\mu_0$, and its trajectory as $x^{(\mu_0)}(t)$ in problem (8). Then, the function $\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big)$, defined in equation (14), is an optimality function of problem (8).

We omit a detailed proof, but the result is similar to Proposition 3.2.

In the next subsection we are going to argue that this new optimality function in proposition 3.4 captures both directional derivatives and the Minimum Principle; hence, it is the correct framework to use in numerical algorithms.

### *B. Gradient Descent Methods for Relaxed Problems*

First, we show the directional optimality function for problem (8). For the original problem (8), given the control's stochastic process as $\mu_0$ and the system's trajectory as $x^{(\mu_0)}$, the directional optimality function is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_l\Big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\Big) = \\
&= \min_{\substack{\delta x\in L^2([0,T],\mathbb{R}^n)\\ \delta\mu\colon [0,T]\to\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)}} \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x}\big(x^{(\mu_0)}(T)\big)'\delta x(T) \\
&\text{subject to: } \dot{\delta x}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\big(t,x^{(\mu_0)}(t),u\big)\mathrm{d}\mu_{0,t}(u)\delta x(t)+ \\
&\qquad\qquad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\big(t,x^{(\mu_0)}(t),u\big)\mathrm{d}\delta\mu_t(u), \\
&\qquad \delta x(0)=0, \\
&\qquad \operatorname{supp}(\delta\mu_t+\mu_{0,t})\subset U, \\
&\qquad \delta\mu_t+\mu_{0,t}\geq 0, \\
&\qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}\mathrm{d}\delta\mu_t(u)=0 \text{ for a.e. } t\in[0,T].
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

*Proposition 3.5:* For the original problem (8), the function defined in equation (15) is an optimality function.

We omit a detailed proof, but it is similar to [13, Theorem 5.6.8 and 5.6.9].

Now we can show the connection between the directional and Pontryagin optimality functions.

*Theorem 3.6:* The optimality functions for the relaxed control problem (8), $\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big)$ in equation (14), and $\theta_l\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big)$ in equation (15), are equivalent.

We omit a detailed proof, but the argument follows using the costate of the optimal control problem (8) to derive the Fréchet derivative of the cost function. Then rewrite $\theta_l$ in equation (15) with the costate of problem (8).

Since the optimality function $\theta_l\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big)$ in equation (15) is also the first order Taylor extension of problem (8), after relaxing the problem, we are able to find a descent direction to the optimization problem (2) based on the Pontryagin principle. Before we show the optimization algorithm and its convergence, first we show that the optimality functions in equations (15) and (14) find a descent direction. Then we introduce a line search algorithm here in the infinite-dimensional space which is similar to Armijo [21].

*Proposition 3.7:* Let $\mu_0$ be a stochastic process of the control in problem (8) and its corresponding trajectory $x^{(\mu_0)}$ to the nonlinear dynamic system in problem (8). Suppose $\big(\delta x^{(\delta\mu_0)},\delta\mu_0\big)$ is the argument to the optimality function (15), such that

$$\theta_l\Big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\Big) = \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x}\big(x^{(\mu_0)}(T)\big)'\delta x^{(\delta\mu_0)}(T), \tag{16}$$

where $\theta_l\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big)$ is the optimality function in equation (15), and $x^{(\mu_0)}$ is the trajectory of the linear system under the optimal stochastic variance $\delta\mu_0$ in the problem (15). Then there exists $\lambda\in(0,1)$ such that $\mu_0+\lambda\delta\mu_0$ is a new control's stochastic process with its corresponding trajectory, $x^{(\mu_0+\lambda\delta\mu_0)}$, in the nonlinear optimization problem (8). Moreover, for the cost function in problem (8)

$$\Psi\big(x^{(\mu_0+\lambda\delta\mu_0)}(T)\big)\leq\Psi\big(x^{(\mu_0)}(T)\big).$$

The proof is based on the linearization of problem (8) and the property that $\theta_l$ is always negative when it is at a non-optimal point.

According to theorem 3.6, the argument of the Banach optimality function in equation (15) is also the argument of the Hamiltonian optimality function in equation (14). Thus the Hamiltonian optimality function finds the same descent direction.

With a descent direction, we now introduce a line search algorithm to find a step size which is similar to the method of Armijo [21]. Suppose trajectory $x^{(\mu_0)}$ is based on control process $\mu_0$ in problem (8), and further suppose that $\delta\mu_0$ is the argument to $\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\big)$ and $\delta x^{(\delta\mu_0)}$ is its linearized system's trajectory in problem (15). Let $\alpha,\beta\in(0,1)$, and then the step size for $\mu_0$ is chosen as $\beta^{\eta(\mu_0)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta(\mu_0) = \min\{k\in\mathbb{N}\mid &\Psi\big(x^{(\mu_0+\beta^k\delta\mu_0)}(T)\big)- \\
&-\Psi\big(x^{(\mu_0)}(T)\big)\leq\alpha\beta^k\theta_h\Big(x^{(\mu_0)},\mu_0\Big)\},
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $x^{(\mu_0+\beta^k\delta\mu_0)}$ is the trajectory of the dynamics in the problem (8) with $\mu_0+\beta^k\delta\mu_0$.

Now we can show the numerical algorithm in the infinite dimensional continuous space as algorithm 1 and its convergence.

*Theorem 3.8:* Let $\{\mu_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of control processes generated by algorithm 1, and let $\{x^{(\mu_i)}\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be its corresponding sequence of trajectories in the dynamical system in problem (8). Then

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \theta_h\Big(x^{(\mu_i)}, \mu_i\Big) \to 0.$$

The proof is similar to [9, Theorem 5.12].

## IV. SYNTHESIS OF RELAXED OPTIMAL INPUTS

Now that we have established a theoretical foundation for the equivalence between computing relaxed optimal control inputs and the Pontryagin Minimum Principle, we focus our attention on the development of numerical algorithms to synthesize approximated optimal control inputs. As we show in this section, the use of relaxed inputs is beneficial not only from a theoretical point of view, but also in our numerical algorithms, since the optimal control problem becomes equivalent to solving a sequence of convex optimization problems, even when the dynamical system is nonlinear.

### A. Vector Field Representation

As we show in section III-B, it is possible to formulate an iterative gradient descent method using relaxed inputs that converges to Pontryagin-optimal points. This theoretical iterative method revolves around computing the value of $\theta_h$, as defined in equation (14), which aims to find a new stochastic process that locally reduces the cost function of the problem in equation (8).

*Proposition 4.1:* The optimization problem in equation (14) is convex.

We omit a detailed proof, but it can be shown that the feasible set and cost function of problem (14) are both convex.

We now focus our attention on methods to numerically represent the feasible set of the problem in equation (14).

*Proposition 4.2:* Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then

$$\left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f(x,u)\,\mathrm{d}\mu(u) \mid \mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m),\ \mathrm{supp}(\mu) \subset U \right\} = \\ = \mathrm{co}\{f(x,u) \mid u \in U\}, \quad (18)$$

where $\mathrm{co}(S)$ is the convex hull of a set $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

**Algorithm 1** Optimization algorithm to problem (8) in the infinite dimensional space

**Require:** $\big(x^{(\mu_0)}, \mu_0\big)$, $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$.

1: $k \leftarrow 0$.
2: **loop**:
3: Compute $\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_k)}, \mu_k\big)$ and $\delta\mu_k$ based on problem (14).
4: Compute $\eta(\mu_k)$ based on problem (17).
5: **if** $\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_k)}, \mu_k\big) = 0$ **then return** $\big(x^{(\mu_k)}, \mu_k\big)$.
6: $\mu_{k+1} \leftarrow \mu_k + \beta^{\eta(\mu_k)}\delta\mu_k$.
7: Update $x^{(\mu_{k+1})}$ based on $\mu_{k+1}$ and dynamic system in problem (8).
8: $k \leftarrow k+1$.
**End loop**.

We omit a detailed proof, but the result follows since the convex hull is clearly contained in the left-hand side set of all possible expected values, and every expected value can be written as the limit of a sequence of points in the convex hull since all Lebesgue-Stieltjes integrals can be approximated using finite Riemann integrals [22].

The result in Proposition 4.2 suggests that to synthesize optimal inputs, we need only to be able to compute the convex hull of the vector field at any given state $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now, some points in the convex hull of the vector field have a particular input vector $u \in U$ associated with them, but others cannot be directly realized.

On the other hand, every point in the convex hull is, by definition, a convex combination of a finite set of vectors in the vector field. Hence, we can approximate the convex hull of the vector field at each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with the convex hull of a finite collection of samples of the vector field for a set $\{\hat{u}_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$. Moreover, as shown in [9] and [10], we can arbitrarily approximate the trajectories resulting from any convex combination of vectors in a finite vector field by using a projection operation that results in switching between those vectors. In the next section we overview the main results of this method.

### B. Sampled-Based Synthesis

First we are going to show that by using samples we can obtain approximations of the convex hull and the stochastic process. Given a control's stochastic process, $\mu$, and its trajectory $x^{(\mu)}$ for the system in problem (8) at time $t \in [0,T]$, the sampling points for the vector field are $\big\{f\big(t, x^{(\mu)}(t), u_i\big)\big\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$, where $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \subset U$. Each sampling point has a corresponding weight, and the sequence of $\{w_i(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{i}^{N_s} w_i(t) = 1. \quad (19)$$

$$w_i(t) \geq 0,\ \forall i \in \{1, \cdots, N_s\}. \quad (20)$$

We use these sampling points and their weights to represent the stochastic process. Asymptotically, the sampling and approximation converge to $\mu$.

*Proposition 4.3:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_s} w_i(t) f\Big(t, x^{(\mu)}(t), u_i\Big) \to \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\Big(t, x^{(\mu)}(t), u\Big)\, d\mu_t(u),$$

asymptotically as $N_s \to \infty$, for a. e. $t \in [0,T]$.

We omit a detailed proof, but the result is based on the Monte Carlo principle and particle filtering [23], [24].

A similar result holds for approximating the stochastic process's variance, $\delta\mu$, with sampling points in the vector field.

Since numerically the number of sampling points is finite and, at each time step, the only difference between each samples is the control value in the vector field, we get a relaxed switched system. At time $t$, the chance to perform control under value $u_i$ is its weight $w_i(t) \in [0,1]$. In order

to reconstruct a deterministic control, we need to project the weights $\{w_i(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ from $[0,1]^{N_s}$ into $\{0,1\}^{N_s}$, and at the same time, preserve the trajectory, $x^{(\mu)}$, and the sum of $w_i(t)$ to be 1. We use wavelet transformation and pulse-width modulation (PWM) to perform the projection. After wavelet transformation, the weight, $w_i(t)$, becomes a piecewise constant in energy spectrum space, and by using the PWM operator, we project the weight back into time space with only 0/1 values. Details about reconstructing a deterministic control from a relaxed switch system can be found in section 4.4 [9].

Now we present the numerical version of algorithm 1. In the algorithm, the sampling values for the control are fixed as $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \subset U$. At each iteration, the control's stochastic process, $\mu_k$, and its vector field at time $t$ are approximated by the samples' weights, $\{w_{k,i}(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$. Also, we define the approximated weights to $\delta\mu_k$ from equation (14) as $\{\hat{w}_{k,j}(t)\}_{j=1}^{N_k}$. $\{\hat{w}_{k,j}(t)\}_{j=1}^{N_k}$ are derived from the discrete version of equation (14) with a regularity term formulated by taking the $l_1$ norm of the weights,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_h\big(x^{(\mu_k)}, \{w_{k,i}\}_{i=1}^{N_s}\big) = \\
&= \min_{\hat{w}_{k,i}(t)\in\mathbb{R}} \quad \int_{t=0}^{T} p_0(t)'\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{N_s} f\big(t, x^{(\mu_k)}(t), u_i\big)\, \hat{w}_{k,i}(t)\Big)\, dt + \\
&\qquad\qquad + \eta_w \int_{t=0}^{T} \|\hat{w}_{k,i}(t)\|_1\, dt, \\
&\qquad \text{subject to:} \quad \text{for a. e. } t \in [0,T], \\
&\qquad\qquad w_{k,i}(t) + \hat{w}_{k,i}(t) \geq 0,\ \forall i \in \{1,\cdots,N_s\}, \\
&\qquad\qquad \text{and} \ \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \hat{w}_{k,i}(t) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We add a regularity term $\|\hat{w}_{k,j}(t)\|_1$ in equation (21) and $\eta_w > 0$ is the weight. The addition of the regularity term is due to numerical computation and the following proposition

*Proposition 4.4:* For a signed measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, if we define its norm as $\|\nu\|$, then the $\theta_h$ in equation (14) with a regularity term is still an optimality function of problem (8), and it does not lose its convergence property. We write this new optimality function as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_n\big(x^{(\mu_0)}, \mu_0\big) = \\
&= \min_{\delta\mu:\,[0,T]\to\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^m)} \int_0^T p_0(t)' \Big( \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} f\big(t, x^{(\mu_0)}(t), u\big) \mathrm{d}\delta\mu_t(u) + \\
&\qquad + \|\delta\mu_t\| \Big) \mathrm{d}t, \\
&\qquad \text{subject to:} \quad \mathrm{supp}(\delta\mu_t + \mu_{0,t}) \subset U, \\
&\qquad\qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} \mathrm{d}\delta\mu_t(u) = 0 \text{ for a. e. } t \in [0,T].
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

We give a sketch of proposition 4.4 here. First, by construction we can show $\theta_n$ in equation (22) is always non-positive. Second, when $\theta_h$ reaches zero, $\theta_n$ is also zero. Hence, $\theta_n$ is an optimality function as well, and adding a regularity term does not change the critical points indicated by the optimality function, and therefore the convergence holds.

Now we can show the numerical implementation of algorithm 1 as follows:

**Algorithm 2** Numerical implementation to the optimization algorithm of problem (8)

**Require:** $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$, $\{w_{0,i}(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$, $x^{(\mu_0)}$, and $\alpha, \beta \in (0,1)$.

1: $k \leftarrow 0$.
2: **loop**:
3: Compute $\theta_h$ and $\{\hat{w}_{k,i}(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ based on problem (21).
4: **if** $\theta_h = 0$ **then** Follow the section 4.4 [9] to use wavelet and PWM to reconstruct the optimal $u_o(t)$ from $\{w_{k,i}(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$. **return** $x^{(\mu_k)}$, $\mu_k$ and $u_o(t)$.
5: Compute $\eta(\mu_{k,t})$ based on problem (17).
6: $w_{k+1,i}(t) \leftarrow w_{k,i}(t) + \beta^{\eta(\mu_{k,t})}\hat{w}_{k,i}(t),\ \forall i \in \{1,\cdots,N_s\}$.
7: Update $x^{(\mu_{k+1})}$ based on $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ and $\{w_{k+1,i}(t)\}_{i=1}^{N_s}$ and dynamic system in problem (8).
8: $k \leftarrow k+1$.
**End loop**.

## V. Simulation Results

In this section, we show two preliminary simulations to validate the performance of our numerical algorithm 2.

### A. Constrained LQR

The first simulation is a constrained LQR problem and can be transformed into a form like problem (2). The time horizen is $T = 2$, and the system has seven states as $x \in L^2([0,2],\mathbb{R}^7)$, two controls as $u \in L^2([0,2],\mathbb{R}^2)$, the initial states are $\xi = 0$ and the problems' final cost function is $\Psi\big(x(T)\big) = x_7(2)$. The dynamic of the problem $\dot{x} = f(t, x(t), u(t))$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1(t) &= x_4(t), \\
\dot{x}_2(t) &= x_5(t), \\
\dot{x}_3(t) &= x_6(t), \\
\dot{x}_4(t) &= -\gamma x_3(t) - \frac{d}{m}x_4(t) + \frac{1}{m}u_1(t), \\
\dot{x}_5(t) &= -\frac{d}{m}x_5(t) + \frac{1}{m}u_2(t), \\
\dot{x}_6(t) &= -\frac{m\,g\,l}{J}x_3(t) + \frac{r}{J}u_1(t), \\
\dot{x}_7(t) &= \big(x_1(t) - c_1\big)^2 + \big(x_2(t) - c_2\big)^2 + x_3^2(t) + \\
&\quad + \eta\, u'(t)u(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $x_{4,5,6}$, are the time derivatives of $x_{1,2,3}$ respectively. The controls, $u_{1,2}$, are applied to $x_{4,5,6}$. The last state, $x_7$, is related to the optimal control problem's cost. It measures the difference between the current states of $x_{1,2,3}$ and the target, $(c_1, c_2, 0)$, and balances the total energy applied to the system. The parameters are given as $J = 0.0475$, $m = 1.5$, $r = 0.25$, $g = 9.8$, $\gamma = 0.51$, $d = 0.2$, $l = 0.05$, $\eta = 0.05$, and $c_1 = -0.3$, $c_2 = -0.5$. We use 81 points to sample




Fig. 1. Trajectory of states $x_{1,2,3}$ under optimal control in section V-A. The states start from the origin (blue dot) to the end (blue triangle), which is $(-0.29, -0.56, -0.06)$.




(a) The absolute value of optimality function, $\theta_h$, at each iteration, in $log_{10}$ scale.

(b) The optimal controls reconstructed by PWM, top is $u_1$ and bottom is $u_2$. When time $t \geq 0.5$, the controls, $u_{1,2}$, are zero.

Fig. 2. Results of the simulation in section V-A, a contrained LQR problem.

the vector field, whose $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{81}$ are evenly distributed in the control's space $U = [-1, 1]^2$.

The result validates our algorithm's performance and convergence. Figure 1 shows the trajectory of the first three states of the system as they move from the origin to the target. Figure 2b shows the corresponding controls after wavelet and PWM reconstruction. Since the problem's cost accounts for the difference between the target and current states during the whole time horizon, the algorithm prefers to add huge energy at the very beginning to modify $x_{1,2,3}$. Figure 2a shows the optimality function's absolute value at each iteration, and we can see the absolute value of $\theta_h$ decreases to lower than $10^{-5}$ after 62 iterations, which shows the convergence of our algorithm.

### *B. Quadrotor helicopter*

Now, we consider an application to control a quadrotor helicopter in 3-dimensional space using a nonlinear model described in [25].

The optimal control problem also can be rewritten in to the form of the problem in equation (8). The problem's time horizen is $T = 2$[s], it has 13 states, $x \in L^2([0, 2], \mathbb{R}^{13})$, 4 controls, $u \in L^2([0, 2], \mathbb{R}^4)$, which are inside $U = [0, 2]^4$, and the cost function $\Psi(x(T)) = x_{13}(2)$. The helicopter's initial states are $\xi = 0$, and its dynamic system $\dot{x}(t) = f\big(t, x(t), u(t)\big)$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_1(t) &= x_4(t),\\
\dot{x}_2(t) &= x_5(t),\\
\dot{x}_3(t) &= x_6(t),\\
\dot{x}_4(t) &= \frac{-b}{m}x_1(t) + \frac{1}{m}\sin x_8(t) K\vec{1}' u(t),\\
\dot{x}_5(t) &= \frac{-b}{m}x_2(t) + \frac{1}{m}\sin x_7(t)\cos x_8(t) K\vec{1}' u(t),\\
\dot{x}_6(t) &= \frac{-b}{m}x_3(t) - g + \frac{1}{m}\cos x_7(t)\cos x_8(t) K\vec{1}' u(t),\\
\dot{x}_7(t) &= x_{10}(t),\\
\dot{x}_8(t) &= x_{11}(t),\\
\dot{x}_9(t) &= x_{12}(t),\\
\dot{x}_{10}(t) &= -x_{11}(t)x_{12}(t) + \frac{L}{I_x}K(u_2(t) - u_4(t)),\\
\dot{x}_{11}(t) &= x_{10}(t)x_{12}(t) + \frac{L}{I_y}K(u_3(t) - u_1(t)),\\
\dot{x}_{12}(t) &= \frac{K}{I_x + I_y}\Big(u_1(t) - u_2(t) + u_3(t) - u_4(t)\Big),\\
\dot{x}_{13}(t) &= (x_1(t) - c_1)^2 + (x_2(t) - c_2)^2 + (x_3(t) - c_3)^2 +\\
&\quad + \sin^2(x_7(t)) + \sin^2(x_8(t)) + \sin^2(x_9(t)) + \eta\, u'(t)u(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

The first three states, $x_{1,2,3}$, represent the helicopter's position in x, y, z coordinations respectively, and $x_{4,5,6}$ are their related time derivatives. The states, $x_{7,8,9}$, represent the angular displacement of the quadrotor body axes, and $x_{10,11,12}$ are their time derivatives. The final state, $x_{13}$, is related to the problem's cost, and it measures the difference between helicopter's current and target position, $c_{1,2,3}$, and balances the energy usage be the four motors, $u_{1,2,3,4}$.

Here, we have simulate the helicopter moving down to $(-1.2, -1.0, -1.0)$ and up to $(1.2, 1.0, 1.0)$. At the same time, we also keep the helicopter's axes displacement as tiny as possible and balance the energy usage. The parameters for the helicopter are $m = 1.3$ [kg], $I_{x,y} = 0.0605$ $\left[\text{kg} \cdot \text{m}^2\right]$, $g = 9.8\left[\text{m/s}^2\right]$, $b = 0.1$ and $K = 1.0$, $\eta = 0.05$.

We use 625 sampling points and the convergence threshold is $\theta_h \leq 10^{-4}$. The trajectories of the positions, $x_{1,2,3}$, and the body axes displacement, $x_{7,8,9}$, under optimal controls are shown in figures 3 and 4. Simulation results show our algorithm gives the optimal solutions to move the helicopter to the target positions and maintain a small body axes displacement at the same time.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we present a theoretical formulation, and a corresponding numerical algorithm that can find Pontryagin-optimal inputs for general dynamical systems by using a direct method. The numerical implementation is based on a relaxed-control system and PWM reconstruction. Preliminary results validate the algorithm's performance. However, the current sampling method is to fix the sampling controls in




Fig. 3. The helicopter's trajectory moves from the origin (blue dot) down to $(-1.12, -1.12, -0.98)$ (blue triangle) under the optimal control. Blue arrows are perpendicular vectors to the helicopter's plane, which are used to represent body axes.




Fig. 4. The helicopter's trajectory climbs from the origin up to $(1.23, 1.23, 1.18)$ (blue triangle) under the optimal control. Blue arrows are perpendicular vectors to the helicopter's plane, which are used to represent body axes.

the vector field, so it does not fully use the fact that the sampling points consist a convex hull in vector field space. When the dimension of the control is high, in order to make the algorithm perform well, chances are a large number of sampling points will be needed, which influence the memory usage and computation efficiency. In the future, the algorithm's improvement will focus on updating the relaxed control process by using only the vertices of the convex hull, which are constructed by the sampling points.

## REFERENCES


[1] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, K. Glover *et al.*, *Robust and optimal control*. Prentice hall New Jersey, 1996, vol. 40.

[2] D. P. Bertsekas, D. P. Bertsekas, D. P. Bertsekas, and D. P. Bertsekas, *Dynamic programming and optimal control*. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA, 1995.

[3] A. E. Bryson, *Applied optimal control: optimization, estimation and control*. CRC Press, 1975.

[4] R. E. Bellman and S. E. Dreyfus, *Applied dynamic programming*. Princeton University Press, 1962.

[5] S. P. Boyd and C. H. Barratt, *Linear Controller Design: Limits of Performance*. Prentice hall New Jersey, 1991.

[6] A. V. Rao, "A survey of numerical methods for optimal control," *Advances in the Astronautical Sciences*, vol. 135, no. 1, pp. 497–528, 2009.

[7] J. Warga, *Optimal control of differential and functional equations*. Academic press, 1972.

[8] ——, "Relaxed variational problems," *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 111 – 128, 1962.

[9] R. Vasudevan, H. Gonzalez, R. Bajcsy, and S. S. Sastry, "Consistent Approximations for the Optimal Control of Constrained Switched Systems—Part 1: A Conceptual Algorithm," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 4463–4483, 2013.

[10] ——, "Consistent Approximations for the Optimal Control of Constrained Switched Systems—Part 2: An Implementable Algorithm," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 4484–4503, 2013.

[11] L. D. Berkovitz, *Optimal control theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1974, vol. 12.

[12] S. C. Bengea and R. A. DeCarlo, "Optimal control of switching systems," *automatica*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 11–27, 2005.

[13] E. Polak, *Optimization: algorithms and consistent approximations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 1997, vol. 124.

[14] A. L. Schwartz, "Theory and implementation of numerical methods based on runge-kutta integration for solving optimal control problems," Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1996.

[15] H. Gonzalez, R. Vasudevan, M. Kamgarpour, S. S. Sastry, R. Bajcsy, and C. Tomlin, "A numerical method for the optimal control of switched systems," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2010 49th IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 7519–7526.

[16] J. T. Betts and W. P. Huffman, "Mesh refinement in direct transcription methods for optimal control," *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–21, 1998.

[17] J. T. Betts, *Practical Methods for Optimal Control and Estimation Using Nonlinear Programming*, 2nd ed. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010.

[18] J. T. Betts, S. L. Campbell, and N. N. Kalla, "Initialization of direct transcription optimal control software," in *42nd IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control*, vol. 4, Dec 2003, pp. 3802–3807.

[19] L. S. Pontryagin, *Mathematical theory of optimal processes*. CRC Press, 1987.

[20] S. Wright and J. Nocedal, "Numerical optimization," *Springer Science*, vol. 35, pp. 67–68, 1999.

[21] L. Armijo, "Minimization of functions having lipschitz continuous first partial derivatives," *Pacific Journal of mathematics*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 1–3, 1966.

[22] P. J. Davis and P. Rabinowitz, *Methods of numerical integration*. Academic Press, 1984.

[23] C. Andrieu, N. De Freitas, A. Doucet, and M. I. Jordan, "An introduction to mcmc for machine learning," *Machine learning*, vol. 50, no. 1-2, pp. 5–43, 2003.

[24] M. S. Arulampalam, S. Maskell, N. Gordon, and T. Clapp, "A tutorial on particle filters for online nonlinear/non-gaussian bayesian tracking," *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 174–188, 2002.

[25] P. Pounds, R. Mahony, and P. Corke, "Modelling and control of a quadrotor robot," in *Proceedings Australasian Conference on Robotics and Automation 2006*. Australian Robotics and Automation Association Inc., 2006.